

Generic local Hamiltonians are gapless

Ramis Movassagh^{1,*}

¹*Department of Mathematics, IBM TJ Watson Research Center, Yorktown Heights, NY, 10598*

We prove that quantum local Hamiltonians with generic interactions are gapless. In fact, we prove that there is a *continuous density of states* arbitrary close to the ground state. The Hamiltonian can be on a lattice in any spatial dimension or on a graph with a bounded maximum vertex degree. The type of interactions allowed for herein include translational invariance in a disorder (i.e., probabilistic) sense with some assumptions on the local distributions. We calculate the scaling of the gap with the system's size in the case that the local terms are distributed according to gaussian β -orthogonal random matrix ensemble. As a corollary there exist finite size partitions with respect to which the ground state is arbitrarily close to a product state. In addition to the lack of an energy gap, we prove that the ground state is degenerate when the local eigenvalue distribution is discrete. This work excludes the important class of truly translationally invariant Hamiltonians where the local terms are all equal.

The gap of a quantum Hamiltonian is the positive difference of the two smallest distinct energies. Since finite systems have a finite number of energy levels, one says that the system is gapless if the gap goes to zero in the limit that the size of the system becomes arbitrary large. Otherwise we say the system is gapped. There is a stronger notion of gapless-ness in which there is a continuous stack of energy levels sitting on top of the ground state.

The size of the energy gap has fundamental implications for the physics of quantum many-body systems. In particular, vanishing of the gap is a necessary condition for criticality and quantum phase transitions, while gapped systems exhibit massive excitations and short-range correlations. Demonstrating whether a quantum system is gapped (e.g., the AKLT model [1]) or gapless (e.g., quantum spin liquids [21]) continues to be a central part of condensed matter, quantum information, and mathematical physics. The multiplicative growth of the dimension and non-commutativity make the analysis of the spectral properties of quantum systems daunting. In particular, the spectral gap problem was recently proved to be undecidable [7].

In mathematics *generic* means almost surely, or with probability one. In other words, a property that holds generically occurs with overwhelming probability.

*Electronic address: q.eigenman@gmail.com

On the one hand, in physics closing of the gap often requires fine-tuning of the parameters (say to a critical point). From a mathematical perspective, eigenvalue degeneracy is of low measure. Therefore, one may be lead to intuit that closing of the gap is too special and non-generic. On the other hand, in the theory of disordered systems such as Griffith's singularities, the existence of rare regions lead to critical behavior in the thermodynamical limit [6]. The occurrence of rare regions is often assumed to be exponentially small (compare with the Remark after Theorem 2).

So these raise the questions: Can one find a computable low measure subset of Hamiltonians for which gapped-ness of it is decidable? Among all possible quantum local Hamiltonians, is the gapped subset of full measure? Or is a randomly chosen local Hamiltonian typically gapped or gapless?

Here we give definitive answers to these questions by proving that local Hamiltonians are generically gapless. Our results extend to shed light on other issues such as scaling of the gap with the system's size for the gaussian ensembles, as well as, exact ground state degeneracy. The explicit constructions we give affirm the old intuitive notions from physics that assert the existence of rare local regions.

Much is known about generic Hermitian matrices and operators. For example, the energy statistics of gaussian orthogonal ensembles universally follows the Wigner-Dyson semi-circle distribution [10]. The behavior of extreme eigenvalues is given by the Tracy-Widom laws [19]. Despite these exciting advances, the standard results in random matrix theory are of limited applicability in disordered quantum matter. A key difference is that in quantum many-body systems the interactions are *local* and the resulting Hamiltonian, even in the most generic case, resides in a very special sub-manifold in the space of all possible operators. In the physical sub-manifold that respects locality, very little is known about the aspects of entanglement and energy statistics.

Randomness, disorder, and noise have brought a number of fascinating phenomena into the world of physics from two-dimensional quantum gravity to spin glass phases to the localization problem to mathematical tools from modern random matrix theory [3, 9, 13]. Formally, the techniques borrowed from probability and measure theories, analysis and random matrix theory are vitally useful in proving typicality statements.

More structured randomness, such as random projectors as local interactions are central in the quantum information community, where they serve as random clauses (i.e., constraints) for the satisfiability problem and provide a natural representation for frustration free systems. In quantum complexity theory a state that is simultaneously the zero energy state of everyone of the projectors serves as the quantum satisfying assignment [4]. Since full rank orthogonal projections

are trivial, one defines a generic projector to be rank deficient but with generic (e.g., Haar distributed) eigenvectors. In spin chains, the ground state degeneracy of generic local projectors is well understood [16]. Despite these and recent breakthroughs in efficient simulation of gapped one-dimensional systems [11], rigorous results are rare and especially difficult to obtain for gapless systems or in higher dimensions [20].

Although, strict translational invariance does not occur in nature, many models in physics are translationally invariant (i.e., all local interactions are equal). In the case of strict translational invariance, the only known rigorous results for generic aspect of the gap is the classification of the gap of spin-1/2 one-dimensional chains with nearest neighbor rank-1 projector interactions, in which both gapped and gapless phases occur [5]. Indeed, in the presence of strict translational invariance symmetry, there are many gapped models (e.g., AKLT) as well as many gapless models (e.g., critical systems).

In this paper we prove that generic local Hamiltonians are almost surely gapless under some natural assumptions on the local eigenvalue distributions (see below). The Hamiltonian can be on a lattice in any spatial dimension or a graph with bounded vertex degrees. The results include local Hamiltonians with translational invariance in a disorder (i.e., probabilistic) sense, where local terms can be independent random matrices (e.g., spin glass interactions).

Specifically, Theorem 1 and Corollary 2 prove vanishingly small gap for continuous and discrete local eigenvalue distributions respectively. In addition, Corollary 1 proves that the ground state is degenerate with a high probability if the local eigenvalue distribution is discrete. Theorem 2, proves a vanishingly small gap for random local projectors of either certain fixed ranks or randomly varying ranks with Haar distributed eigenvectors. These interactions are central from a quantum information and complexity perspectives.

Theorem 2 has an independent proof because, unlike Theorem 1 and Corollary 1, random projectors do not obey a natural assumption (Assumption 1), that standard random matrix ensembles obey. Moreover, the gap of a single local projector is always one since the eigenvalues are zero or one. This combined with not obeying Assumption 1, makes the proof of lack of an overall energy gap more difficult for the local projector problem.

Although we prove the lack of an energy gap with minimal assumptions, the actual scaling of the size of the system with the gap depends on the distribution of the local terms and is not generic. In Section, II we quantify the scaling for local terms distributed according to random gaussian ensembles.

I. PROBLEM STATEMENT AND DEFINITIONS

Let the local Hamiltonian be the operator acting on the Hilbert space $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes n}$, where n is the total number of particles and d is the dimension of the local Hilbert space (e.g., number of spin states). Formally the most general local Hamiltonian is expressed as,

$$H(N) = \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \mathbb{I} \otimes H_{i,j} \quad (1)$$

where N is the total number of summands, $\langle i, j \rangle$ denotes nearest neighbors, $H_{i,j}$'s are $d^2 \times d^2$ matrices and $\mathbb{I}$ is an identity matrix of size $(\mathbb{C}^d)^{\otimes (n-2)}$ on all particles other than i and j . Because of the Hermitian symmetry each H_{ij} has $d^2 + \frac{\beta}{2}d^2(d^2 - 1)$ real independent parameters, where $\beta = 1, 2$ and 4 correspond to real, complex and quaternion gaussian matrices. Unless specified otherwise, below $\mathbb{I}$ indicates identity on all sites excluding the interaction. Since Pauli matrices form a basis, in condensed matter community one expresses the random parameters as coefficients of Pauli matrices. For example a generic spin-1/2 chain over the complex numbers, in the standard Pauli basis, Eq. (1) can be expressed as (for an open chain $N = n - 1$)

$$H(n) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{I}_{2^{j-1}} \otimes \left\{ \sum_{\alpha, \beta=0}^3 J_{\alpha, \beta, j} \sigma_j^{(\alpha)} \sigma_{j+1}^{(\beta)} \right\} \otimes \mathbb{I}_{2^{n-j-1}},$$

where $J_{\alpha, \beta, j}$ are $16n$ random parameters as expected, and $\sigma^{(0)}, \sigma^{(1)}, \sigma^{(2)}$ and $\sigma^{(3)}$ are the Pauli matrices

$$\sigma^{(0)} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma^{(2)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma^{(3)} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

To meaningfully take a limit of arbitrary large N , we assume that $H_{i,j}$'s have bounded norms denoted by $\|H_{i,j}\|$, which means that $(H_{i,j}^\dagger H_{i,j})^{1/2}$ has a bounded maximum eigenvalue. We also assume that the number of nearest neighbors of any given $H_{i,j}$ is a constant independent of N . We work with finite dimensional Hilbert spaces and consider N to be arbitrary large. Below for simplicity we denote $H(N)$ simply by H and say matrices A and B are ϵ close if $\|A - B\| \leq \epsilon$.

The Hamiltonian induces a probability measure, or a density of states $\mu(H(N))$, over the real numbers, such that the integral over an interval gives the expected fraction of the eigenvalues in

it. Formally,

$$d\mu(\lambda) = \frac{1}{d^n} \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^{d^n} \delta(\lambda - \lambda_i) \right\rangle d\lambda.$$

The weaker definition of gapless-ness only requires that the smallest two distinct eigenvalues merge as $N \rightarrow \infty$. There is yet a stronger definition in which there is a continuous density of states connected to and above the ground state. Formally,

Definition 1. (weaker) Let $\lambda_0(H)$ and $\lambda_1(H)$ be the smallest and second smallest eigenvalues of H respectively. The gap of H is defined to be $\lambda_1(H) - \lambda_0(H)$. We say H is gapless if for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $N > 0$ such that $\lambda_1(H) - \lambda_0(H) \leq \epsilon$.

Remark 1. The gap here refers to the positive difference of the smallest two distinct energies irrespective of possible finite size degeneracies of the ground state. In this paper, we actually prove a stronger statement, that there is a continuous density of states above the ground state.

Definition 2. (continuous density of states) Let $j = O(f(N))$ where $f(N)$ is a monotonically increasing function of N satisfying $f(N) = o(d^N)$. Let $\lambda_0(H)$ and $\lambda_j(H)$ be the smallest and j th smallest eigenvalues of H respectively. We say $H(N)$ has a continuous density of states above the ground state if for any $\epsilon > 0$ and $j > 0$ there exists a positive integer N_j such that $\lambda_j(H) - \lambda_0(H) \leq \epsilon$ for all $N > N_j$.

In the theory of Anderson localization, weak randomness leads to localization of eigenstate and existence of Lifshitz tails [22]. In condensed matter physics it is intuitively expected that localization type interactions would lead to gapless-ness [17]. Perhaps much more surprising is gapless-ness of general disordered systems given by Eq. (1) that among other physical systems include quantum spin systems as well.

II. CONTINUOUS LOCAL TERMS

In this section, we assume that the joint distribution of the eigenvalues of a local term obeys a niceness property that most standard finite random matrix ensembles that we know of possess [12, 14]. Mathematically, we assume:

Assumption 1. For all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a real number $\mu_{i,j}$ such that the probability for all of the eigenvalues of $H_{i,j}$ to be within ϵ of $\mu_{i,j}$ is positive.

Let us illustrate Assumption 1 by constructing a local term from the gaussian unitary ensemble (GUE). Let A be a $d^2 \times d^2$ matrix whose entries are standard complex normals. Then $(A + A^\dagger)/2$ is an instance of GUE whose eigenvalues we claim can be arbitrary close. In particular, A has a positive probability of being ϵ close to a multiple of the identity.

Theorem 1. *H is almost surely gapless and has a continuous density of states above the ground state, if $H_{i,j}$'s are independent and each $H_{i,j}$ has a continuous joint distribution of eigenvalues that obeys Assumption 1.*

Proof. Let $H_{p,q}$ be a fixed local term and rewrite Fig. (1) as

$$H = \mathbb{I} \otimes H_{p,q} + \sum_{|\langle i,j \rangle|=1} \mathbb{I} \otimes H_{i,j} + \sum_{|\langle i,j \rangle| \geq 2} \mathbb{I} \otimes H_{i,j} \quad (2)$$

where the first sum includes all the local terms that overlap with $H_{p,q}$ at a site (i.e., have distant 1) and the second sum all the terms with no overlap with $H_{p,q}$ (at least a distant 2). Let the number of overlapping terms be z . For example, on a square lattice $z = 4D - 2$ where D is the spatial dimension.

Because of Assumption 1 there is a positive probability that there exists $H_{p,q}$ whose two smallest eigenvalues are ϵ apart. In addition, by independence of the local terms there is a positive probability that every neighbor of $H_{p,q}$ is ϵ close to a multiple of the identity. At $\epsilon = 0$, we define H_0 to be

$$H_0 \equiv \mathbb{I} \otimes H_{p,q}^0 + \sum_{|\langle i,j \rangle|=1} \beta_{i,j} \mathbb{I} \otimes \mathbb{I}_{i,j} + \sum_{|\langle i,j \rangle| \geq 2} \mathbb{I} \otimes H_{i,j} \quad (3)$$

where the superscript zero on the first term means that $H_{p,q}^0$ has a degenerate smallest eigenvalue denoted by λ_0 .

Let λ_E be the smallest eigenvalue of $\sum_{|\langle i,j \rangle| \geq 2} \mathbb{I} \otimes H_{i,j}$. By assumption $H_{p,q} = H_{p,q}^0 + \delta H_{p,q}$, where $\|\delta H_{p,q}\| \leq \epsilon$ and the summands of distant 1 terms are $H_{i,j} = \beta_{i,j} \mathbb{I}_{i,j} + \delta H_{i,j}$, where $\|\delta H_{i,j}\| \leq \epsilon$. Since $\|\mathbb{I} \otimes \delta H_{i,j}\| = \|\delta H_{i,j}\|$, by Weyl's inequalities [2, Chapter 3] the two smallest eigenvalues of H , denoted by $\lambda_{min}^{\epsilon,k}$ with $k \in \{1, 2\}$, obey

$$\lambda_E + \beta + \lambda_0 - B \leq \lambda_{min}^{\epsilon,k} \leq \lambda_E + \beta + \lambda_0 + B, \quad (4)$$

where $B = \|\delta H_{p,q} + \sum_{|\langle i,j \rangle|=1} \delta H_{i,j}\| \leq \epsilon(z+1)$, and $\beta \equiv \sum_{|\langle i,j \rangle|=1} \beta_{i,j}$. Since for any fixed ϵ the configuration just described has a positive probability, we can find a sufficiently large N_0 such

that for the system's size $N > N_0$ there is a site whose two smallest eigenvalues are ϵ apart and whose neighbors are ϵ close to a multiple of the identity. Since $z + 1$ is finite and ϵ can be arbitrary small, we conclude that H is gapless in the weaker sense of Definition (1). This completes the proof of lack of an energy gap between the ground state and the first excited state.

Now suppose the configuration given by Eq. (3) is realized for $N = N_0$. Then, almost surely there is an $N_1 > N_0$ with another rare local region $H_{\bar{p},\bar{q}}$ which is ϵ -close to a configuration similar to

$$H = \mathbb{I} \otimes H_{\bar{p},\bar{q}} + \sum_{|\langle i,j \rangle|=1} \mathbb{I} \otimes H_{i,j} + \sum_{|\langle i,j \rangle| \geq 2} \mathbb{I} \otimes H_{i,j},$$

where, as before, the first two eigenvalues of $H_{\bar{p},\bar{q}}$ are ϵ -close and all distant 1 terms are ϵ -close to a multiple of the identity. Exact same arguments as above ensure that the four lowest energy states are ϵ -close. The procedure can be repeated for $N_2 > N_1$ etc.. Therefore, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a monotonically increasing function $f(N)$ and a $j = O(f(N))$ such that $|\lambda_j - \lambda_0| \leq \epsilon$ for all $N > N_j$. We conclude that there is a continuous density of states about the ground state. $\square$

Comments: Proof for k -local Hamiltonians with $k > 2$ is similar. The function $f(N)$ in the proof depends on the details of the local distribution. In the following subsection we prove the scaling of the gap with the systems' size for canonical random matrix ensembles.

The way in which the gap closes as a function of the size gives insight into the physical properties such as the dynamical exponents. The scaling of the gap with the systems' size in general would depend on the local statistics of the eigenvalues, geometry and symmetries of the lattice or connectivity of the graph, and the local dimension of the Hilbert space (i.e., d). A canonical ensemble of random matrices is the β -gaussian ensemble. The $\beta = 1, 2$ and 4 ensembles are called orthogonal (GOE), unitary (GUE) and symplectic (GSE) ensembles, respectively, because the underlying measures are invariant under actions of these groups.

Example: Scaling of the gap when local terms are from canonical gaussian ensembles

We first answer the following question: What is the probability that all the eigenvalues of an instance of an $n \times n$ G(O/U/S)E matrix are ϵ -close? In other words, what is the probability that a random matrix from the gaussian β -ensemble is ϵ -close to a multiple of identity? Throughout we think of n as a fixed positive integer. A lot is known about asymptotic behavior, but for the

problem at hand n can be quite small.

Mathematically, for $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ we want to calculate the following probability

$$P [\|M_n - a\mathbb{I}_n\|_F \leq \epsilon, \forall a \in \mathbb{R}], \quad (5)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_F$ is the Frobenius norm. Let M_n be a G(O/U/S)E matrix with eigenvalues $x_1 \geq x_2 \geq \dots \geq x_n$; it is well-known that the eigenvalue density is [18, Section 2.6]

$$\rho_\beta(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = Z_n(\beta) \exp \left(-\frac{\beta}{4} \sum_{j=1}^n x_j^2 \right) \prod_{1 \leq j < k \leq n} |x_j - x_k|^\beta \quad (6)$$

where $Z_n(\beta)$ is the normalization constant that only depends on β and n . In the GUE case, $Z(\beta = 2) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{n/2} \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} j!}$.

The known measure of G(O/U/S)E matrices for general β is

$$\mu_n(\beta) = C_n(\beta) e^{-\frac{\beta}{4} \text{tr}(M_n)^2} dM_n.$$

Comment: The ensemble is clearly invariant under any orthogonal transformation $M_n \rightarrow UM_nU^{-1}$, where U is a unitary (β -orthogonal in general).

Take the eigenvalue decomposition $M_n = UDU^{-1}$ with $D = \text{diag}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ and $x_1 \geq x_2 \geq \dots \geq x_n$ being the eigenvalues.

Fix $a \in \mathbb{R}$, and denote by $\mathbb{I}_n$ the $n \times n$ identity matrix. Let $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ and let us compute the probability

$$P [\|M_n - a\mathbb{I}_n\|_F \leq \epsilon].$$

The probability density of M_n is proportional to

$$e^{-\frac{\beta}{4} \text{Tr}(a\mathbb{I}_n)} = e^{-\frac{\beta na^2}{4}}$$

and the volume of a ball of radius ϵ in n^2 -dimensions is proportional to ϵ^{n^2} , so [18, Section 2.6]

$$P [\|M_n - a\mathbb{I}_n\|_F \leq \epsilon] = (C'_n(\beta) + o(1)) \epsilon^{n^2} e^{-\frac{\beta na^2}{4}}, \quad (7)$$

where $C'_n(\beta)$ is a constant that depends on n and β and $o(1)$ term goes to zero as ϵ goes to zero.

This serves as a lower bound for Eq. (5). But a is an arbitrary point on the real line, the

contribution from all such points is upper-bound by the integral

$$\mathbb{P} [\|M_n - a\mathbb{I}_n\|_F \leq \epsilon, \forall a \in \mathbb{R}] \leq \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathbb{P} [\|M_n - a\mathbb{I}_n\|_F \leq \epsilon] da = (C_n''(\beta) + o(1)) 2\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{n\beta}} \epsilon^{n^2}, \quad (8)$$

for a new constant $C_n''(\beta)$. Since n is fixed, we conclude that

$$\mathbb{P} [\|M_n - a\mathbb{I}_n\|_F \leq \epsilon, \forall a \in \mathbb{R}] = (C_n'''(\beta) + o(1)) \epsilon^{n^2}, \quad (9)$$

where $C_n'''(\beta)$ is yet a new constant.

Suppose the number of overlapping terms with H_{pq} is z . Because of the independence, the probability of all of them being ϵ -close to a constant multiple of the identity is (we restore $n = d^2$)

$$(K_n(\beta) + o(1)) \epsilon^{zd^4}$$

where $K_n(\beta)$ is a constant. Moreover the probability that the smallest two eigenvalues of a matrix chosen from the gaussian ensemble are ϵ -close is bounded by ϵ^4 [8]. Therefore the probability that a rare local region given by Eq. (3) occurs is

$$(K_d'(\beta) + o(1)) \epsilon^{zd^4+4}.$$

Note that the β dependence only enters through the pre-factor which is independent of ϵ .

How large does the system have to be for the expected gap to be as small as ϵ ? For the gap to be ϵ small, the expected number of term in the Hamiltonian Eq. (1) is $N \sim \epsilon^{-zd^4-4}$, and we conclude that

$$\epsilon(N) \sim N^{-1/(zd^4+4)}. \quad (10)$$

The scaling of the size with gap that we just derived depends on the particular structure of the rare local region, where the neighboring sites of $H_{p,q}$ are ϵ -close to a multiple of an identity. There may be different rare configurations that protect the near two-fold degeneracy of the ground state of $H_{p,q}$ with less restriction on the overlapping terms. It would be interesting if configurations that were found that would give the scaling $\epsilon(N) \sim N^{-1/4}$. We leave this for future works.

III. DISCRETE LOCAL TERMS

More restrictive are local terms with *discrete* eigenvalue distributions, in which any two local eigenvalues are either equal or a constant apart; i.e., cannot be ϵ close. Also the neighbors are either exactly a multiple of the identity or a constant distant apart. Corollary 2 proves that such Hamiltonians are also gapless. Now we prove that their ground states are degenerate.

Corollary 1. *If the local eigenvalues have a discrete distribution satisfying Assumption 1, then the ground state is almost surely degenerate and can be represented as a product state.*

Proof. If the eigenvalue distribution is discrete, in the proof of the theorem above, we would have a finite probability of existence of a $H_{p,q}$ whose smallest eigenvalue is *exactly* k -fold degenerate and its nearest neighbors are exactly proportional to the identity matrix. Let the ground state of all the terms in the Hamiltonian excluding $H_{p,q}$ be $|\theta_E\rangle$, and let us denote the eigenvectors of the smallest eigenvalue of $H_{p,q}$ by $|\psi_{pq}^{(\ell)}\rangle$ where $\ell \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. Then the ground states of H are product states $|\theta_E\rangle \otimes |\psi_{pq}^{(\ell)}\rangle$ and are k -fold degenerate. $\square$

If the discrete distribution has a finite number of atoms in its distribution, then the above corollary suggests a *large* degeneracy of the ground state. We now turn to the gap of random projectors which does not obey Assumption 1.

Theorem 2. *H is almost surely gapless if the local terms have independent and Haar distributed eigenvectors, and $H_{i,j}$ in Fig. (1) are random projectors whose individual ranks are either:*

1. *Fixed and at most $d(d-1)$.*
2. *Vary randomly among the terms in the Hamiltonian.*

Proof. Let an arbitrary vertex on the lattice or the graph be at the fixed position $\mathbf{r}_0$ and rewrite Fig. (1) as

$$H = \sum_{|\langle i, \mathbf{r}_0 \rangle|=1} \mathbb{I} \otimes H_{i, \mathbf{r}_0} + \sum_{|\langle i, j \rangle| \geq 2} \mathbb{I} \otimes H_{i, j} \quad (11)$$

where the first sum includes all the terms that act on $\mathbf{r}_0$ and its neighboring vertices (distant 1), and the second sum includes the rest of the interactions.

To prove the first statement take $H_{i,j}$ in Fig. (1) to be random projectors with the rank $d(d-1)$. Let $\pi = \text{diag}(0, 1, \dots, 1)$ be the diagonal projector of rank $d-1$ and $\mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{r}_0}$ an $d \times d$ identity matrix acting on $\mathbf{r}_0$. Since eigenvectors are Haar, there is a positive probability density that all the terms in the first sum in Fig. (11) take the form $\pi \otimes \mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{r}_0}$. Examples of this are illustrated in Fig. 1.




Figure 1: Examples of H_0 (Fig. (13)) on a line and a square lattice, where for simplicity we dropped the subscript $\mathbf{r}_0$ on $\mathbb{I}$

By independence of local terms and Haar-distribution local eigenvectors, for sufficiently large N almost surely there will be a site $\mathbf{r}_0$, whose neighbors are ϵ close to projectors of the form just described. By assumption $\epsilon = 0$ corresponds to neighbors having the exact form.

We write

$$\sum_{|\langle i, \mathbf{r}_0 \rangle|=1} \mathbb{I} \otimes H_{i, \mathbf{r}_0} = \sum_{|\langle i, \mathbf{r}_0 \rangle|=1} \mathbb{I} \otimes (H_{i, \mathbf{r}_0}^0 + \delta H_{i, \mathbf{r}_0}), \quad (12)$$

where the superscript zero denotes $\epsilon = 0$, and by assumption $H_{i, \mathbf{r}_0}^0 = \pi_i \otimes \mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{r}_0}$ and $\|\mathbb{I} \otimes \delta H_{i, \mathbf{r}_0}\| \leq \epsilon$.

Define the $\epsilon = 0$ Hamiltonian by $H_0 \equiv \sum_{|\langle i, \mathbf{r}_0 \rangle|=1} \mathbb{I} \otimes H_{i, \mathbf{r}_0}^0 + \sum_{|\langle i, j \rangle| \geq 2} \mathbb{I} \otimes H_{i, j}$, which is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 &= \mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{r}_0} \otimes \left\{ \sum_{|\langle i, \mathbf{r}_0 \rangle|=1} \pi_i \otimes \mathbb{I} + \sum_{|\langle i, j \rangle| \geq 2} \mathbb{I} \otimes H_{i, j} \right\} \\ &\equiv \mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{r}_0} \otimes H_E, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where H_E is the Hamiltonian acting on all sites other than $\mathbf{r}_0$ (inside braces) and $\mathbb{I}$ in the distant-2 terms excludes i, j and $\mathbf{r}_0$. By eigenvalue decomposition we have $H_E = \Theta_E^{-1} \Lambda_E \Theta_E$, where Λ_E is the diagonal matrix of eigenvalues and Θ_E is the unitary matrix of eigenvectors. We arrive at the desired result where $H_0 = \mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{r}_0} \otimes \Theta_E^{-1} \Lambda_E \Theta_E$; the eigenvalues of this Hamiltonian all have a d -fold algebraic multiplicity.

Let $|\theta_E\rangle$ denote the ground state of H_E with the energy $\lambda_E \geq 0$, the ground states of H_0 can be taken to be

$$|\Psi_k\rangle = |e_k\rangle \otimes |\theta_E\rangle, \quad (14)$$

where $|e_k\rangle$ are the standard vectors supported at $\mathbf{r}_0$ and the corresponding eigenvalues of H_0 are $\lambda_{\min}^{0,(k)} = \lambda_E$, where $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$. For $\epsilon > 0$ what used to be degenerate ground state energies of H_0 , generically split, i.e., $\lambda_{\min}^{\epsilon,(k)} \neq \lambda_{\min}^{\epsilon,(\ell)}$, where $k, \ell \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ and $k \neq \ell$. Since $\|\sum_{|\langle i, \mathbf{r}_0 \rangle|=1} \mathbb{I} \otimes \delta H_{i, \mathbf{r}_0}\| \leq z \|\delta H_{\max}\|$, Weyl inequalities [2, Chapter 3] imply that for all k

$$-z\epsilon \leq \lambda_{\min}^{\epsilon,(k)} - \lambda_E^{(0)} \leq z\epsilon \quad (15)$$

where, as before, $\|\mathbb{I} \otimes \delta H_{i, \mathbf{r}_0}\| = \|\delta H_{i, \mathbf{r}_0}\|$, z is the number of nearest neighbor terms to $\mathbf{r}_0$ (e.g., $z = 2D$ on a square lattice in D spatial dimensions) and $\delta H_{\max}$ is the overlapping term with the maximum error norm.

Since the eigenvectors are Haar and the dimension of the local kernels is d , for any fixed ϵ we can find a sufficiently large N in which there is a site whose all neighbors are ϵ close to $\mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{r}_0} \otimes \pi$. Since z is finite and ϵ can be arbitrary small, by Fig. (15) the d smallest eigenvalues of H_0 will be $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ apart giving an arbitrary small gap.

Lastly if we allow variable ranks of $H_{i,j}$, then the same construction as above guarantees having a site on which the Hamiltonian acts trivially and the above argument guarantees ϵ splitting of the eigenvalues and lack of an energy gap in the limit. The proof for having a continuous density of states above the ground state is entirely similar to that given in Theorem 1. $\square$

The proof generalizes for local projectors of fixed ranks $d(d-h)$, with $d > h \geq 1$ on lattices or graphs whose degrees are constants independent of N . All that needs to be changed in the proof above is to let $2 \leq \dim(\text{Ker}(\pi)) < d$. We believe this proof technique can be generalized to projectors with higher ranks, where configurations other than the ones constructed here (e.g., Fig. 1) would be needed.

Remark. The probability of occurrence of a rare local region is a function of lattice geometry, and the distribution function of the local eigenpairs. In particular, the probability of being ϵ -close to a local disconnected region may be small or large.

In Corollary 1 and under Assumption 1, we proved that the ground state is degenerate. Now we show that the gap closes without using Assumption 1; i.e., irrespective of possible ground state degeneracy.

Corollary 2. *The Hamiltonian is almost surely gapless if the local eigenvalues have a discrete eigenvalue distribution and eigenvectors are Haar distributed.*

Proof. This follows a construction similar to that given in Theorem 2. Suppose $\lambda_{pq}^1, \lambda_{pq}^2, \dots, \lambda_{pq}^d$ are d discrete eigenvalues of the distribution that are not all equal. Then with an arbitrarily high probability we can find a site, $\mathbf{r}_0$, whose neighbors are all ϵ close to having the form $\mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{r}_0} \otimes \text{diag}(\lambda_{pq}^1, \lambda_{pq}^2, \dots, \lambda_{pq}^d)$. In Theorem 2 replacing π with $\text{diag}(\lambda_{pq}^1, \lambda_{pq}^2, \dots, \lambda_{pq}^d)$ and following the same argument that lead to Fig. (15), we arrive at the bound on the gap being $|\lambda_{\min}^{\epsilon, (k)} - \lambda_E^{(0)}| \leq 2z\epsilon$, where ϵ can be arbitrary small. $\square$

IV. LIMITATIONS, DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Limitations of our work

In nature, strict translational invariance is not realistic. However, to make the study of matter more tractable, idealized models are often considered that have translational symmetry. Our work excludes this important class of Hamiltonians, where all the local terms are exactly equal. There are various such models that are gapped (e.g., the AKLT) or gapless (e.g., critical systems); therefore, there may not be a unique generic gap behavior. However, vanishing of the gap is a necessary condition for criticality. Translationally invariant critical models that one usually encounters require fine-tuning to a critical point. So one may expect that in the presence of strict translational invariance, gapped models would have a larger measure than gapless phases. It might be possible to classify the gap when the local terms are equal. So far, this has been achieved for spin-1/2 frustration free spin chains [5].

Lastly, gap and entanglement in quantum systems are intimately connected. It is true that we could show that there are small partitions with respect to which the ground state can be unentangled, but this says very little about the entanglement about arbitrary divisions, most notably into subsets of similar size.

Discussions and Conclusions

In the proofs we used Weyl's theorem. Had we used first order perturbation theory, for example in Fig. (15), instead of $|| \sum_{|i, \mathbf{r}_0|=1} \mathbb{I} \otimes \delta H_{i, \mathbf{r}_0} ||$, we would have $\lambda_{\min}^{\epsilon, k} = \lambda_E^{(0)} + \sum_{|i, j|=1} \langle \theta_E \otimes e_k | \delta H_{i, \mathbf{r}_0} | \theta_E \otimes e_k \rangle + O(\epsilon^2)$. However, the general issue with using standard perturbation theory to prove lack of an energy gap is that one would have to prove that a constant gap does not open up in all higher order terms. This is not obviously so, since the k^{th} correction multiplying ϵ^k involves a sum of combinatorially many terms and may actually become comparable to ϵ^{-k} in the magnitude. This

in turn causes the series to diverge beyond that order. This issue is often met with in (particle) physics.

Although the general spectral gap problem is undecidable [7], we have proved that under minimal genericity assumptions local Hamiltonians are gapless in any dimension. What is most surprising from a physical point of view, is the existence of so many gapless systems. In addition, we showed that there are finite partitions with respect to which the ground state is arbitrary close to a product state (Corollary 1 and Fig. (14)), and proved exact degeneracy when the local interactions have a discrete distribution. This work applies to Hamiltonians whose local terms are drawn from random matrix ensembles or are random projectors. In particular we computed the scaling of the gap with the systems' size when the local distribution is from the canonical random matrix ensembles.

On the one hand, the extremal eigenvalue statistics of random matrices are governed by the Tracy-Widom laws [19]. On the other hand, for classical spin glasses, central limit theorem ensures gaussian statistics of the eigenvalues. The density of states of generic quantum spin chains was shown to be in-between the two extremes [15]; it would be interesting to show and quantify the generic gap scaling as a function of the two extremes as well.

Acknowledgments

I thank Toby Cubitt, Peter Shor and Barry Simon for discussions. I thank the AMS-Simons travel grant and IBM TJ Watson Research Center for the freedom and support offered by the Goldstine Fellowship.

-
- [1] Ian Affleck, Tom Kennedy, Elliott H Lieb, and Hal Tasaki. Rigorous results on valence-bond ground states in antiferromagnets. *Physical review letters*, 59(7):799, 1987.
 - [2] Rajendra Bhatia. *Matrix analysis*, volume 169. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
 - [3] Kurt Binder and A Peter Young. Spin glasses: Experimental facts, theoretical concepts, and open questions. *Reviews of Modern physics*, 58(4):801, 1986.
 - [4] Sergey Bravyi. Efficient algorithm for a quantum analogue of 2-sat. *Contemporary Mathematics*, 536:33–48, 2011.
 - [5] Sergey Bravyi and David Gosset. Gapped and gapless phases of frustration-free spin-1/2 chains. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 56(6):061902, 2015.

- [6] John Cardy. *Scaling and renormalization in statistical physics*, volume 5. Cambridge university press, 1996.
- [7] Toby S Cubitt, David Perez-Garcia, and Michael M Wolf. Undecidability of the spectral gap. *Nature*, 528(7581):207–211, 2015.
- [8] László Erdős, Benjamin Schlein, and Horng-Tzer Yau. Local semicircle law and complete delocalization for wigner random matrices. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 287(2):641–655, 2009.
- [9] Thomas Guhr, Axel Müller-Groeling, and Hans A Weidenmüller. Random-matrix theories in quantum physics: common concepts. *Physics Reports*, 299(4):189–425, 1998.
- [10] Fumio Hiai and Dénes Petz. *The semicircle law, free random variables and entropy*. Number 77. American Mathematical Soc., 2006.
- [11] Zeph Landau, Umesh Vazirani, and Thomas Vidick. A polynomial time algorithm for the ground state of one-dimensional gapped local hamiltonians. *Nature Physics*, 11(7):566–569, 2015.
- [12] Vladimir A Marčenko and Leonid A Pastur. Distribution of eigenvalues for some sets of random matrices. *Mathematics of the USSR-Sbornik*, 1(4):457, 1967.
- [13] Madan Lal Mehta. *Random matrices*, volume 142. Academic press, 2004.
- [14] ML Mehta and A Pandey. Spacing distributions for some gaussian ensembles of hermitian matrices. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 16(16):L601, 1983.
- [15] Ramis Movassagh and Alan Edelman. Density of states of quantum spin systems from isotropic entanglement. *Physical review letters*, 107(9):097205, 2011.
- [16] Ramis Movassagh, Edward Farhi, Jeffrey Goldstone, Daniel Nagaj, Tobias J Osborne, and Peter W Shor. Unfrustrated qudit chains and their ground states. *Physical Review A*, 82(1):012318, 2010.
- [17] Günter Stolz. An introduction to the mathematics of anderson localization. *Entropy and the quantum II. Contemp. Math*, 552:71–108, 2011.
- [18] Terence Tao. *Topics in random matrix theory*, volume 132. American Mathematical Society Providence, RI, 2012.
- [19] Craig A Tracy and Harold Widom. Level-spacing distributions and the airy kernel. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 159(1):151–174, 1994.
- [20] Frank Verstraete. Worth the wait. *Nature Physics*, 11:524–525, 2015.
- [21] Xiao-Gang Wen. *Quantum field theory of many-body systems: from the origin of sound to an origin of light and electrons*. Oxford University Press on Demand, 2004.
- [22] Sho Yaida. Instanton calculus of lifshitz tails. *Physical Review B*, 93(7):075120, 2016.